DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 231 895 UD 022 830

AUTHOR Perrone, Vito
TITLE A Commemoration of Progressive Schools: Past and Present.
INSTITUTION North Dakota Univ., Grand Forks. Center for Teaching and Learning.
PUB DATE May 83
NOTE 15p.; Reprint of paper presented at the Miquon Conference of Progressive Schools (Philadelphia, PA, April 7, 1983).
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Historical Materials (060)
JOURNAL CIT Insights; v15 n8 May 1983

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Change; Educational History; *Educational Philosophy; *Educational Theories; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Progressive Education; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Dewey (John)

ABSTRACT

This paper traces the development of progressivism in American education, a movement that emphasizes the development of all the native capacities of each child, instead of just teaching reading, writing, and the gathering of facts. Focusing first on the post-Civil War period, the author discusses reformists' early arguments against the linear curriculum chain, rote learning, and the formalism and increasing centralization of schools--conditions that resulted from the movement to universalize education. The author then discusses 19th and 20th century progressive reformists and reform movements. Identifying John Dewey as having given the movement its intellectual leadership, the author briefly considers Dewey's theories and the progressive schools that these theories inspired. The paper also examines the decline of educational progressivism during the Depression, and its resurgence in the 1960s. It is suggested that renewed interest in progressivism in the 1960s has not been potent enough to challenge the narrow and technocratic educational formulations that are again dominating thinking about schools. Today, the author stresses, teachers, administrators, and parents must return to the teachings of the early progressivists, and work to reaffirm a liberating view of education. (MJL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED231895

CENTER FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA
GRAND FORKS 58202

Volume 15, Number 8
May 1983

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Clara Pederson
Univ. of North Dakota
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

A Commemoration of Progressive Schools; Past and Present

by Vito Perrone

UD 022 830

INSIGHTS into open education

A Commemoration of Progressive Schools; Past and Present

By Vito Perrone
University of North Dakota

It is a pleasure to be here among so many close friends and mentors for this celebration which commemorates an ongoing and important progressive education strand in a nation that appears more committed than ever to conservative, fairly narrow, educational directions. This is a time when a large number of public school systems in the country view, for example, the arts as elitist, if not frivolous, inquiry as a luxury in addition to being inefficient, community studies as political and controversial, reading as decoding, and writing as mechanics. The achievement of such goals as "raising attendance by five percent," "increasing reading scores [on some standardized test] by ten percent," or "reducing suspensions by twelve percent" are celebrated in many schools. Some even announce these kinds of goals to the world on billboard signs as a means of demonstrating their "purposefulness and vigor." The dominant definers of educational discourse have increasingly become embodied in such phrases as "direct instruction," "time on task," "basic skills," "competency tests," and "instructional systems," to mention only a sample. These are not, as you recognize, particularly noteworthy, liberating or progressive formulations even though the full blown descriptions make use of much that was common in progressive language--individualization, high expectations, and focus on learning being among them.

In light of the current circumstances educationally--and one could certainly find corresponding examples beyond education--it may appear anomolous to be celebrating as we are the visions of those who began the still flowering progressive schools represented at this conference. Those who poured their lives into these schools wanted, as you know, settings in which children and their growth, their natural interests, curiosity, and creativity were primary, places that developed, as Grace Rotzel noted, "all of the native capacities of each child" instead of just teaching reading, writing, and the gathering of facts.[1] Those who sacrificed to construct a base for these schools even talked unabashedly about wanting for children a world in which "cooperation, human understanding, democratic practice--citizenship writ broadly--and peace" were dominant themes. And they characteristically saw the schools as being central to the fulfillment of such a world. While such visions may seem on the surface a bit out of place--even contradictory--in this current manifestation of a technocratic and conservative America, they remain critical, part of the important legacy that each of us here needs to keep alive, the base for a continuing and necessary progressive outline of education.

---

*This presentation was given at the Miquon Conference, Philadelphia, of Progressive Schools, April 7, 1983. This conference commemorated those schools begun between 1910 and 1932 and continuing today to maintain their progressive heritage.

Historically, progressivism in American life, whether in education or in the larger culture, has always been juxtaposed in one way or another with a number of contrary world views. At the turn of the century these progressive views were proclaimed in loud and brassy tones and appeared on the verge of becoming the dominant ideology of twentieth century America; in the 20's and 30's, in the aftermath of a tragic war and in the midst of the great depression, progressivism became quieter while still maintaining much of its intellectual vigor; with World War II and the cold war years that followed, progressivism went into a significant slump; after a brief flowering in the 60's, progressivism has become muted, its sounds barely audible. Much of the responsibility for bringing back a progressive voice, reestablishing in concrete terms a vision of what is possible--at least in regard to education--rests with many of us here.

Given the commemorative nature of this event, it seems appropriate--maybe even necessary--to provide an outline of progressive education in America, to place the schools here within an important historical frame. But it is also necessary I think to place before you a perspective aimed at assuring that the best of progressive thought continues to offer a challenge to the conservative, and simple, formulations of education which are being adopted today with such a vengeance. Neither of these tasks can be done very comprehensively in the time allotted, causing me necessarily to address large themes at the expense of the critical detail.

As a self-conscious movement, Progressivism in America belongs to the turn of the current century, defined by historians as "an attempt to develop the moral will, the intellectual insight and the political and administrative agencies to remedy the accumulated negligences of a period of . . . growth."[2] As a philosophy, however, its roots are obviously older, going back well into the eighteenth century. And as an educational formulation in America, it is necessary to go back to at least the pre-Civil War period for a significant base. It is in this pre-Civil War period that I have chosen to begin this abbreviated discussion of progressivism. To begin at this point educationally is not to suggest that schooling was an unimportant element in American life earlier--after all, legislation supporting public schools came as early as 1647 in Massachusetts--but it is in that period, specifically the 1840's, when a serious commitment to universal education was initiated.[3]

Horace Mann in Massachusetts, Henry Barnard in Connecticut, and John D. Pierce in Michigan were the early evangelists for universal education, the establishment of schools where, to paraphrase the sentiment of the day, "all of America's children could meet, where democratic life could be nurtured, strong character built, and economic and cultural growth guaranteed." While the common schools hardly became, understandably, the enlightened settings Mann, Barnard, and Pierce envisioned, they did rather quickly become part of the universal fabric of American society. Those of us from the West--the other side of the Appalachians--were steeped in the literature of our nineteenth century origins--of schools and towns being built simultaneously, with the ever present search for a suitable "school marm."

The schools grew even more rapidly than Mann could have envisioned, especially in the post-Civil

War period. Not surprisingly, given the growth, however, pedagogical practices and teacher training tended not to keep pace. (This also occurred to some degree in the growth period of the 1950's.) As the schools enlarged in number and became incorporated into State systems, they also became increasingly more systematized and formal. America's rhetoric has always favored informality and decentralization but the organizational practices have tended to be otherwise. The graded patterns we know so well had become by 1870 the norm. Covering the material encompassed within first, second, third grade readers, for example, became a dominant theme in the schools. (There has even been in some settings a resurrection of these nineteenth century readers in the belief that some idyllic past can be reconstructed.) Memorization took up much of a child's time. The language of the factory, rapidly becoming in the latter nineteenth century a dominant force in the American economy, became, as well, the metaphoric language of the broader culture, the schools included.[4]

While universalism was the stated goal, it was difficult to achieve. Fewer than 25 percent who began school in the nineteenth century, for example, completed the elementary programs. And in spite of the best hopes of such egalitarians as Mann, the common schools, especially in the East, served mostly the poor and lower middle classes (with blacks generally excluded). Those with means found other institutions for their children. Widespread public commitments to support secondary schools only came in the closing decades of the nineteenth century. (There were, to cite an example, 35,000 elementary school students in North Dakota in 1890 but fewer than 500 enrolled in secondary schools.) Tending to be academic in nature, these late nineteenth century secondary schools attracted, in contrast to the common elementary schools, few young people from working class or newly-arrived immigrant families. Only in the 1920's did the high schools begin to attract these populations in any significant numbers. In 1900, only eight percent of those of secondary school age were attending a post-eighth grade school. (And we need to go to the post-World War II period, by the way, before the percentage in school gets close to anything one could truly label universalism.)[5]

This nineteenth century beginning was fraught with difficulties not unlike those currently faced by a myriad of third world developing countries. (That, by the way, is how my third world students understand this history.) Fiscal support was inadequate and school facilities could not be built rapidly enough to take care of the numbers of children who wished to attend. In addition, precedents for mass schooling didn't exist and the surrounding social order was in a state of rapid transition, especially in the urban areas. (Urban population, for example, increased from 9.9 million in 1870 to over 30 million by 1900. Many of our major cities doubled in population during this period of time.[6])

In spite of the acknowledged difficulties, however, there were persons around who were willing to challenge pedagogical practice and organizational patterns in the schools, to offer alternative visions of what was possible. This, I believe, is important to acknowledge now when so many have given up on any belief that much can be done in the schools or that this is not a safe time to speak. To read these turn-of-the-century accounts is to gain some understanding of the

intelligent, thoughtful, often courageous debates that undergirded the early twentieth century progressive critique that led to the founding of the schools represented here at this commemorative conference. Narrowly the basic challenges tended to focus on breaking the linear curriculum chain, the rote nature of teaching and learning, the formalism and the growing centralization of schools. Broadly the focus was on the creation of a more democratic society. Brooks Adams, a prominent historian and Boston School Board member, framed the critique as well as anyone in an 1879 Atlantic essay when he wrote, "Knowing that you cannot teach a child everything, it is best to teach a child how to learn."[7] With this he proceeded to show that most practice had no connection to such a purpose.

Now granted the general direction of such a critique did not represent a majority position but it was repeated, as well as elaborated upon, often enough by a sufficient number of people to encourage the beginnings of an important reform movement. Who were some of the early progressive reformers of the common school? Referred to by John Dewey as the "Father of Progressive Education," Frances W. Parker accepted in 1873 the superintendency of the Quincy, Massachusetts, schools with a commitment to "bring back enthusiasm for teaching and learning." He quickly initiated policies to bring an end to the linear, lockstep curriculum along with the traditional readers and spellers; encouraged teacher initiative in the development of curriculum, supported the use of newspapers, magazines, and field trips into the community as a base for local history and geography; and introduced manipulative devices for teaching arithmetic. Parker was intent on large scale reform, so much so that he aroused considerable controversy.

In response to some of his critics in the State Department of Education who thought the Quincy schools were abandoning reading, writing, and mathematics and "experimenting with children," Parker wrote in his 1879 annual report to the School Committee:

> *I am simply trying to apply well established principles of teaching...the methods springing from them are found in the development of every child. They are used everywhere except in school....*[8]

I suspect that many here have said such a thing on any number of occasions. Certainly Dewey's early efforts began with such a premise as did those of the founders of the schools most of you here represent.

In 1882, Parker went on to the directorship of the Cook County Normal and Practice School in Chicago where he continued to promote child-centered practices. His Talks on Pedagogics, published in 1894, was particularly popular among teachers, representing in its own way an early progressive tract.

As the nineteenth century drew to a close, proposals to focus on the child rather than subject matter, on active rather than passive learning, began to come from a wide range of sources, outside as well as inside of the organized educational establishment. (This, by the way, was true also in the 1960's.) Even as I comment on this, however, I remain perplexed at how little the schools formally allied themselves with these external reform activities, how separate the worlds were, how separate they remain today.

One such important source was the Settlement House movement. The

range of activities engaged in by the settlement houses was particularly large. Their agendas, as you might recall, included active campaigning for improved housing, child labor laws, neighborhood recreational facilities, and provisions for medical care, including a national health insurance plan. In addition to struggling for the construction of increased numbers of elementary schools, leaders in the settlement houses called for a different kind of education, one that concerned itself with children's physical and social well-being along with their intellectual growth. Many of the settlement houses organized cooperative nurseries, conducted kindergarten programs, and provided a variety of opportunities for intergenerational learning. They tended to view education as having an integral relationship to their efforts at improving the quality of community life. Jane Addams, one of the most active and forceful leaders of the Settlement House Movement and director of Hull House, used the phrase "socialized education" for the forms she advocated.[9]

Another important early twentieth century source of progressive educational thought came through the Country Life movement which was given intellectual leadership by Liberty Hyde Bailey, Dean of Agriculture at Cornell. The movement grew out of an interest in revitalizing the quality of life in rural communities where population growth had plateaued or begun to decline. In relation specifically to schools, Bailey wrote, "I want to see our country schools without screwed down seats and to see children put to work with tools and soils and plants and problems." In the first two decades of this twentieth century, Cornell turned out lively curriculum materials buttressed by a progressive orientation to schooling.[10]

Another individual who provided impetus for progressivism in schools--indeed the person who is credited with first using the term "progressivism" in regard to schools --was Joseph Meyer Rice. Trained as a pediatrician, Rice became sufficiently concerned about school practice to undertake in 1892, on behalf of the Forum, a leading opinion journal of the day, a status study of American education. His report, which ran in nine issues of the Forum between October 1892 and June 1893, had an electric quality, stimulating widespread public discussion and enough self consciousness among educational reformers to give some shape to an active progressive movement in education. Rice argued that "in city after city, public apathy, political interference, corruption and incompetence were conspiring to ruin the schools [and further] . . . that untrained teachers . . . [were] blindly [leading] their innocent charges in singsong drill, rote repetition, and meaningless verbiage." In addition to his sharp critique, however, Rice called attention to a number of examples of more child centered, progressive practice with Parker's Practice School receiving his most enthusiastic response.

John Dewey, a product of nineteenth century America, but one who maintained an active intellectual life to the middle of our current century, more than any other person, however, gave the progressive movement in education its intellectual leadership. Through his writings, he continues to provide inspiration to many of those who seek more progressive practice in schools.[11] In 1896, Dewey, his wife Alice, and several neighbors began a Laboratory School to put into practice some of the educational theory which Dewey had been generating. The theory was formulated

around education as a means for growth, activity, community building, reciprocity in teaching and learning, moral development, and democracy. He talked often about the school reflecting "The larger society, and permeated throughout with the spirit of art, history, and science."[12] The school opened with sixteen children and two teachers; by 1902, it had one hundred and forty children, twenty-three regular teachers, and ten assistants who were University of Chicago graduate students. While its life was relatively short, closing in 1904, it had a long enough history to help Dewey consolidate his educational theory. Unfortunately, however, what occurred--the practice--in that Laboratory School did not become as accessible in the literature of the early progressive period as Dewey's more theoretical publications. This lack becomes quickly apparent as one reads The Dewey School: The Laboratory School of the University of Chicago, written by Katherine Camp Mayhew and Anna Camp Edwards, sisters who taught in the school, and not published until 1936.[13] In this account, you are brought alongside the thinking, the actual curriculum efforts, children's and teachers' actions, and the careful reflection about practice that permeated the setting. It may well have been early progressivism, in practice, at its best. Had it been a more integral part of the early progressive literature, the movement might have been more solid and developed more successfully.

In Schools for Tomorrow, published in 1915, Dewey presented his educational views in a fairly concrete fashion as well as his analysis that American education was characterized by a lack of democratic practice. In addition, he described (along with his daughter, Evelyn) schools in many parts of the country that were attempting to implement progressive practice. Among the schools that Dewey highlighted was the School for Organic Education in Fairhope, Alabama. This school was founded in 1907 by Marietta Johnson, who was to occupy one of the hallowed niches of Progressive Education. (Grace Rotzel, who was the first administrator of The School in Rose Valley, apprenticed at Fairhope as did many other founders of 1920's progressive schools.) Marietta Johnson's educational autobiography, Thirty Years With an Idea, describes well an educational transformation that many of you here would likely identify with.[14] She came from our neighboring state of Minnesota and taught for several years in St. Paul. At one point she asked the St. Paul superintendent why the school programs had so little relation to children's natural development. His response--to paraphrase--was, "Isn't it disgraceful that they don't?" Shortly thereafter, Marietta Johnson decided to begin a school! She was a woman with deep insights into learning. She was also full of bravado, capable of convincing almost anyone that reform along progressive education lines was absolutely essential to children's well being.

Given the intellectual ferment created in the early years of the twentieth century by some of those I have introduced briefly, buttressed by a large social reform movement, a self conscious progressivism began to take hold in many schools; for example, the University of Missouri Lab School (1904); Caroline Pratt's City and Country School in New York City, The Park School in Baltimore, Bryn Mawr elementary school, and the Edgewood School, Greenwich, Connecticut in 1913; Margaret Naumberg's Walden School in New York City, the Shady Hill School in Cambridge, Massachusetts, the University of Iowa

Elementary School, and the Oak Lane Country Day School in Philadelphia in 1915-16; and the Lincoln School, associated with Teachers College, Columbia in 1917 among others. As the twenties came to an end, there was another revival, including the School in Rose Valley, Miquon, and the Open Air School in Cleveland among others. In addition, the Ethical Culture Schools begun in New York City in the nineteenth century took on a progressive orientation in the 1930's as did the Friends Schools, located in a number of eastern communities. The Minneapolis public schools, the Menominee and Milwaukee schools in Wisconsin and the Winnetka Schools in Illinois also organized self consciously around progressive principles in the 20's. Even in classrooms and schools where self conscious progressivism was not pursued, there was an increasing support for taking the child into account. Formalism of the sort that dominated nineteenth century schools began to subside.[15]

To say that nineteenth century formalism was receding, however, ought not suggest that progressivism in its largest sense had become the dominant practice in schools. Ann Schumacher and Harold Rugg reported in their 1928 study of Child-Centered Schools, in this regard, that: "The Child-Centered Schools as yet constitute but a corporal's guard . . ."[16] Nonetheless, there was enough occurring to keep progressivism alive and capable of influencing educational practice in general. (The 1960's because of the Media attention, also brought, for many, the belief that the schools were all changing. As in the 20's, enough was going on in the 60's to keep progressive hopes alive and influence general practice, but more conservative orientations remained dominant throughout this decade as well.)

With the growth of progressive practice, interest in communication increased. It was this motivation, as well as a desire to bring about more pressure for reform, that served as an impetus for organizing the Progressive Education Association in 1919, the prime mover of which was Stanwood Cobb who had been introduced to progressivism by Marietta Johnson. Charles Eliot, then President of Harvard, accepted the honorary presidency. After Eliot's death in 1927, John Dewey agreed, with some reluctance because of his concerns about the "movement," to accept the honorary presidency. From a modest beginning, the Association grew to almost 11,000 members at its height in 1938. It was vigorous and mission oriented, especially in its early years. Its journal, Progressive Education, begun in 1924, was the education journal of its day.

To read the literature of the late twenties and early thirties, as I have done intensively, is in some ways to relive education in the 60's. There are many parallels in the language, in philosophic orientations. But, as in the sixties, the quality of the analysis did not stay over the years uniformly high. With the growing popularization of progressive views, surface descriptions became dominant. The tie of the schools to the larger culture became increasingly submerged. The interplay of theory and practice got lost in discussions about teaching methods and organizational patterns. Harold Rugg wrote later in this regard that: "Teachers have not become students--either of society, of child needs or curriculum construction."[17] Are things different now? Are teachers, even in the continuing Progressive schools, the students of teaching, of society, of child needs that successful progressivism has always promised?

This is a challenge that needs addressing, now and in the days beyond this conference.

The great Depression, coming as it did, undoubtedly affected progressivism in the schools. The economic collapse was so severe that the problems of the schools paled by comparison. But it is worth noting that in the face of an economic collapse greater than any in the nation's history, school boards maintained many of the programs begun with progressive impetus--namely those in the fine and practical arts as well as in extracurricular activities such as clubs, sports, and theatre. Such is not the case in today's less severe economic crisis, suggesting that progressive impulses are not, unfortunately, generally as potent.

The Progressive Education Association fell into hard times in the 1930's along with the economy. Ideological issues became especially large with individuals such as George Counts pushing for more attention to "social and political obligations." Questions such as inequality in the schools, racial segregation, testing and tracking, and social composition of school boards, about which consciousness was growing, were set aside, to become part of the 1960's movement. These kinds of concerns are arising again as we move into the 80's but who is speaking?

With the second world war, the educational debates went further into eclipse. While the Progressive Education Association continued to publish, the focus of its work was increasingly less connected to practice in the terms that were prominent in its earlier years.

"Life Adjustment Education," especially in relation to the secondary schools, was part of the postwar progressive ideology. Poorly defined, lacking a theoretical base (certainly far removed from Dewey's concept of community) or operational construct, it floundered. "Progressive Education" was no longer popular. Historian Arthur Bester, among others, and a graduate of the progressive Lincoln School, led a series of attacks on post war progressivism. His Educational Wastelands (1953) was a particularly harsh statement describing "life adjustment" education as a "retreat from learning." Schools were on the defensive to an almost unprecedented degree. In 1955, the Progressive Education Association went out of existence and the Progressive Education Journal, long past its vital period, collapsed two years later.

Lawrence Cremin closed out his important work on the Progressive Education movement by suggesting that "Perhaps . . . [Progressivism in Education] only awaited the reformulation . . . that would ultimately derive from a larger resurgence of reform in American life and thought."[18] This may well have been prophetic. The 1960's brought about a major social revolution in the United States. The Civil Rights movement, which gained in momentum in the latter years of the 1950's, was a fulcrum for social and political reform in the 1960's. The inequities in American life became increasingly apparent. The failure of the education system to provide quality schooling on an equal basis to all Americans became a potent issue. Support for pluralism, long cast aside in the wake of melting pot theory, became recognized as necessary for the creation of social democracy. Depersonalization, created in part by increasing levels of technology and bureaucratization in all phases of American life, brought a sometimes radical response. The recognition of how rapidly our natural resources were being depleted

and defaced brought an increased concern for "spaceship earth." And the war in Viet Nam, which proved to be more unpopular than any previous U.S. military involvement, brought protest to a high level. It is within this particular milieu that a new wave of educational reform began, building on much that was basic to earlier reform efforts. Inasmuch as this history is likely to be well within your experience, I'll not comment on it in relation to schools other than to suggest that not enough was learned soon enough from the earlier progressive period to make the most of the opportunities. This was the case, in part, because many 60's progressives seemed to reject historical analysis; but it was also the result of too little good description of earlier practice being accessible for examination.

Did the 60's progressive movement add anything to earlier efforts? There was certainly more supportive learning theory available to buttress good practice; there was a higher overall degree of conscious attention to careful documentation; the meaning of community was affirmed in a more articulate manner; and teacher education efforts became a bit more consonant with practice. But even these advances have been insufficient to keep a reform direction alive in a recessionary economy which exists at a time in which America's long-standing, and dominant, technological, moral, and political position in the world has come under serious challenge.

Given the current circumstances, it would be easy enough to withdraw from efforts to make schools more responsive to children, to negate what has been learned from a long-standing progressive critique as well as practice, to seek shelter in the protective environments that we all know how to create. The schools represented here, legacies of an early twentieth century progressivism, live, in many respects, within such a protected environment, free of many of the burdens of schools in the public arena, especially those in the cities. Given the particular history to which all of us here fall heirs, we can't rest here. John Seger, headmaster of Shady Hill, said it well on the occasion of Shady Hill's fiftieth anniversary, "Shady Hill has been a pioneer, but pioneers have a tendency to become settlers . . ."[19] Let me comment on some of what is important in the struggle to maintain a pioneering spirit which is one of the major purposes Richard Mandel outlined for this Conference.

To begin with, those in schools where progressivism continues to flourish--or at least maintains itself in regard to critical areas of education--need to challenge more directly the narrow, technocratic, educational formulations that have come again to dominate thinking about schools, to make as public as possible their beliefs that schools can be liberating institutions characterized by challenge, a wide assortment of materials, individualization, open-ended inquiry, analysis and synthesis, trade books, art and music, and the like. Such a challenge, however, to be effective must come from teachers and administrators and parents associated with both private and public schools.

In the 60's, there was a good deal of resurgence of progressivism in the public schools and some 1920's style reconnections between public and private school practitioners. While this progressivism continued, as it had, in the long established private schools, such directions were dealt heavy blows in the public schools during the decade of the 70's. With the

diminished support in the public schools for more child centered, progressive practices and the corresponding dominance of such narrow formulations as "basic skills instruction" and "time on task," private-public school connections seem again to have dwindled, even collapsed. Those in the public schools who wish to continue to struggle for a more uplifting, liberating view of education are especially beleaguered, lacking in significant support. Those of you in the private schools need to reach out again, to join those in the public sector to reaffirm the most constructive elements of progressive practice, to regain together a sufficiently potent voice to challenge current formulations of education.

To reaffirm the foregoing is in part to begin again to give attention to careful articulation of purposes and practices, to reestablish some control over the language of good education. One means for such a reaffirmation is to give renewed attention to careful description of teaching and learning written by teachers who are in classrooms which value children's interests and intentions, in which the educational encounter is viewed expansively rather than narrowly as a means of challenging what is becoming an increasingly debilitating literature and corresponding conventional wisdom in which teacher autonomy and professionalism is being diminished and schooling rather than education is becoming preeminent.

To speak of challenging conventional wisdom, to reaffirm support for those older progressive visions, is also to be concerned about the quality of persons being attracted to teaching. My interest in careful description is related. The sixties brought into teaching a large number of young people who genuinely believed that within the schools there would be support for creative attention to the social and intellectual needs of children and young people, room for significant integration of academic and community interests, education in the broadest sense. The Peace Corps attracted similarly motivated persons during those years. Too many of these young people are gone and too few like them are currently considering teaching as a career. Teaching is not generally viewed today--nor typically described today--as personally enriching, challenging and potent; in part, because teaching in too many schools has lost its authority, its source of individuality, and schools, especially in the public arena, have ceased to be the centers of inquiry that promote teacher efficacy. Teaching as a field needs revitalization; it needs to attract again the best and brightest, intellectually and morally. Building a literature of teaching written by those in the midst of settings where teaching continues to have potency would be a wonderful countervailance to the descriptions of teachers as managers, passing out and collecting worksheets which are geared to skill deficiencies identified by scores on a host of standardized and criterion referenced tests; or to the descriptions now being expressed of what "effective" teaching means, especially in settings with a predominance of minority and poor children--namely, "carefully sequenced curriculum, whole group instruction, drill, narrow range of materials, little elaboration, and questions of a low cognitive nature."

I suggest that we all go back again to the descriptions of the Dewey School, to the writings of Grace Rotzel, Julia Weber Gordon, Carolyn Pratt, Agnes DeLima, Ella

Flagg Young, Lelia Partridge, Susan Blow, Marietta Johnson, Agnes Hocking, Ed Yeomans, Katherine Tayler, Lucy Sprague Mitchell, Harriet Johnson, Elwyn Richardson, Frances Hawkins, John Paul, Lydia Smith, Pat Carini, among others, for some sense of what these descriptive efforts might look like.

As an historian, I must relate that I view the descriptions as more than the grist for challenge to contemporary formulations of education; I view them also as an important base for the long term progressive struggle for better schools, part of an ongoing effort to assure that what is being learned is retained, capable of informing the next generation of progressives who might be even more successful because of our efforts now during this time when conditions appear so unsympathetic and complex.

There is obviously so much more one could add to all of this. But this is not the time. Give continuing attention during the deliberations of the conference to the legacy which we hold, ways in which we might challenge more successfully now the state of American education, and how we might give even greater support to each other--a need this conference is meant to address in part--and to those in other settings who struggle in more difficult circumstances to maintain a progressive and liberating view of education. I look forward to the remainder of the conference and wish you all well.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Rotzel, Grace, The School in Rose Valley (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1971).

[2]Hofstadter, Richard, ed., The Progressive Movement (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1963), p. 4.

[3]Lawrence Cremin begins his classic history of progressive education, The Transformation of the School (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1961) with the pre-Civil War debate over universal education.

[4]See Michael Katz, Class, Bureaucracy and The Schools (New York: Praeger, 1971) and Richard Pratte, The Public School Movement (New York: McKay, 1973) for a fuller development of these themes.

[5]In addition to Katz and Pratte, see also: Merle Curti, The Growth of American Thought (New York: Harper and Row, 3rd edition, 1964), Rush Welter, Popular Education and Democratic Thought in America (New York: Columbia University Press, 1962), David Tyack, ed., Turning Points in American Educational History (Waltham, MA: Blaisdell, 1967), Joel Spring, Education and the Rise of the Industrial State (Boston: Beacon Press, 1972), Colin Greer, The Great School Legend (New York: Viking Press, 1972), Edward Krug, The Shaping of the American High School, Vol. I (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1964), and Harold Rugg, Foundations for American Education (New York: World Book Co., 1947).

[6]Hofstadter, p. 2.

[7]Arthur Beringause, Brooks Adams: A Biography (New York: Knopf, 1955), pp. 66-67.

[8]Cremin, p. 130.

[9]See Allen Davis, Spearheads for Reform: The Social Settlements and the Progressive Movement, 1890-1914 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967) and Jane Addams, Twenty Years at Hull House (New York:

Macmillan, 1910 and reprinted 1966).

[10]Liberty Hyde Bailey, The Country Life Movement in the United States (New York: World Book Co., 1911).

[11]Those wishing to read some syntheses of Dewey's thought might refer to Joseph Ratner, Intelligence in the Modern World: John Dewey's Philosophy (New York: Random House, 1939) and Irwin Edman, John Dewey (New York: Bobbs and Merrill, 1955). Dewey was a particularly prolific writer, producing 50 books and innumerable articles. The books which had the most profound impact on progressive education are: School and Society, originally published in 1899 and reprinted by the University of Chicago Press, 1956; How We Think, originally published in 1910 and reprinted by Regnery, 1971; Schools for Tomorrow (with his daughter Evelyn), originally published in 1915 and reprinted by Dutton, 1962; Democracy and Education, originally published in 1916 and reprinted by Macmillan, 1961; Experience and Nature (New York: Macmillan, 1929); Experience and Education, originally published in 1938 and reprinted by Macmillan in 1963.

[12]Dewey, School and Society, p. 29.

[13]Published by Atherton Crofts in 1936. Reprinted by Atherton Press (New York) in 1966.

[14]Thirty Years With an Idea was published by the University of Alabama Press in 1974.

[15]See Harold Rugg and Ann Schumacher, The Child-Centered School: An Approach of the New Education (New York: World Book Co., 1928) for descriptions of many of the progressive schools. Charlotte Winsor, in Experimental Schools Revisited (New York: Agathon Press, 1973), has brought together a number of documents written between 1917-1924 related to a number of the schools noted in the text.

[16]Rugg and Schumacher, p. III.

[17]Rugg, Foundations of American Education, p. 315.

[18]Cremin, p. 253.

[19]Eduard Yeomans, The Shady Hill School; The First Fifty Years (Cambridge, MA: Windflower, 1979), p. 124.

MONOGRAPHS BY THE NORTH DAKOTA STUDY GROUP ON EVALUATION

Coordinated by Vito Perrone

A Syntactic Approach to College Writing by Norton D. Kinghorn, Lester Faigley and Thomas Clemens ($3.50)

A View of Power: Four Essays on the National Assessment of Educational Progress by Paul Olson

An Open Education Perspective on Evaluation by George E. Hein

Children's Interactions in Traditional and Nontraditional Classrooms by Sylvia Ross, Herbert Zimiles and David Gerstein

Children's Journals: Further Dimensions of Assessing Language Development by Amity Buxton ($3.50)

Children's Language and Thinking: A Report of Work-In-Progress by Edith Churchill and Joseph Petner, Jr.

Children's Thinking in the Classroom by Kathe Jervis

Developing Hypotheses About Classrooms from Teachers' Practical Constructs by John Elliott

Evaluation as Interaction in Support of Change by Ruth Anne Olson ($3.50)

First California Conference on Educational Evaluation and Public Policy, 1976 edited by Nick Rayder

Informal Evaluation by Brenda S. Engel

Special Education: The Meeting of Differences by Steven Harlow

Teacher Curriculum Work Center: A Descriptive Study by Sharon Feiman

Teachers' Seminars on Children's Thinking: A Progress Report by Bill Hull

Testing and the Testing Industry: A Third View by John Williams

The African Primary Science Program: An Evaluation and Extended Thoughts by Eleanor Duckworth ($5.00)

The Art of Seeing and the Visibility of the Person by Patricia Carini ($3.50)

The School Lives of Seven Children by Patricia Carini ($5.00)

The Words in My Pencil: Considering Children's Writing by Anne Martin ($3.50)

Use and Setting: Development in a Teachers' Center by Beth Alberty, James Neujahr and Lillian Weber ($3.50)

PRICE: $2.00 unless otherwise indicated
HANDLING CHARGE: 70¢ for one or two copies; 20% for three or more copies
CONDITIONS: All orders must be pre-paid
ADDRESS: North Dakota Study Group
Box 8158
University of North Dakota
Grand Forks, ND 58202

* * * *